

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1-8, 10-21, 25-29 and rejected same. With this paper, claims 1, 17, 19-21, 25 and 28 are amended, claim 18 is canceled and none are added. It is believed that the amendment does not require a new search by the Examiner, and the amendment could not be made earlier because the interpretation of the claims by the Examiner was not expected. Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 17 and 25-29 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nilsson (U.S. Patent No. 6,400,967, Nilsson hereinafter) in view of Cockerill *et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,503,005, Cockerill hereinafter).

Claims 5, 8, 11-16, and 18-21 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nilsson in view of Cockerill and further in view of Kubo (U.S. Patent No. 6,580,923).

The primary reference, Nilsson, pertains to a mobile keyless telephone. A mobile telephone is an electronic communication device. The secondary reference, Cockerill, pertains to a hand-held tape printing device. Even though the tape printing device can be regarded as an electronic device, it is, obviously, not an electronic communication device. Therefore, these two references may be combinable for the prior art purposes only if the claimed subject matter encompasses both types of the devices.

With this paper, claims are amended in a way that the claimed invention is clearly confined as being used for a mobile telecommunication device. Therefore, the features in Cockerill that the Examiner relies on are no longer applicable, because the device of Cockerill is not a mobile telecommunication device.

Furthermore, even though the amendment is made after a final Office Action, the Applicant believes that the amendment does not require further searches by the Examiner, and the amendment should be entered without a Request for Continued Examination.

Throughout the course of the prosecution, the Examiner has performed extensive searches focused on mobile telecommunication devices. Take claim 1 for example, in the Office Action mailed on September 29, 2004, claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Leon *et al* (U.S. 5,896,277). Leon pertains in general to a battery-powered electronic device, in particular to a portable radio device. In the Office Action mailed on May 11, 2005, claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Firooz (U.S. 6,035,035) in view of Kubo (U.S. 6,580,923). Both Firooz and Kubo pertain to portable telephone devices. Further, in the Office Action mailed on November 3, 2005, claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawkins (U.S. 6,516,202) in view of Nilsson. Hawkins, like Nilsson, pertains to a wireless communication device. Finally, in the Office Action mailed on April 7, 2006, claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawkins in view of Nilsson and further in view of Taylor (U.S. 2003/0025679). Taylor, a reference proven to be invalid, pertains to a computer keyboard.

It is, therefore, clear that the searches focused on the mobile communication devices have already been performed multiple times, and none of the above-listed references, taken alone or combined, has all the features of the present invention.

In light of the amendment, Applicant believes that all the remaining claims in the application are patentable and they should be allowed. Withdrawal of the above rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusions

For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the claims of the application are now in condition for allowance, and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited. Applicant's agent urges the Examiner to call to discuss the present response if there are any questions.

Date: 1/4/07

Respectfully submitted,



Shiming Wu

Ware, Fressola, Van Der Sluys & Adolphson LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224
Tel: (203) 261-1234
Customer No.: 004955

Agent for the Applicant
Registration No. 56,885